

Dkt. No.: OP-093000203

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 7-10 are pending. The Examiner has rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 as falling to conform with current US practice. Claims 1-4, 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davis (US Patent No. 6,356,435). Claim 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) or 103(a) by Davis. Claims 7-10 have been rejected under have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Hsu (US Patent Application Publication No. 2005/01172787).

In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 2-6 and amended claims 1, 7 and 8. Special cares have been taken to avoid any informality. It is therefore requested the 112 rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses Examiner's rejections according to the following reasons. First of all, the Examiner affirms Davis disclose the first access unit of Applicant's in Davis' Fig. 1 and the corresponding specification. However, Applicant can not find any related description in Davis' specification to show the elements above the power supply 15 in Fig. 1 are hard drives. In applicant's point of view, Davis' hard drive should be the element in the box under the floppy drive 14 in Davis' Fig. 1, which is still mounted to the front panel as in Applicant's conventional structure. ~~The elements disposed above power supply 15 should be unknown.~~

Furthermore, in the amended claim 1, Applicant's invention is limited to a small form factor computer which is different from Davis'. The small form factor computer has been clearly defined in Application's specification. In structure, the small form factor computer

AMENDMENT

10/807,111

- 4 -

Dkt. No.: OP-093000203

has the motherboard 3 mounted on the bottom portion 11 of the case 1. Applicant's invention provides the heat dissipation channel between the second access unit 4 and the motherboard 3 by changing an allocation of a first access unit 2. Davis' Fig. 1 shows the motherboard 16 located under the cooling assembly 12 and above the video card 17. (There is no idea why element 16 is the motherboard) Davis' do not disclose a heat dissipation channel between the second access unit and the motherboard by changing an allocation of a first access unit, either. Moreover, Applicant's amended claim 1 further includes the hard drivers in a disk array. Even though under the Examiner's assertion that Davis disclose the first access unit installed in the upper portion of the receiving space close to the rear panel, Davis still do not disclose there are the hard drives in the disk array as the first access unit.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's 102 rejections, as stated in MPEP §2131:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

(Emphases added).

That is, the amended claim 1 should be patentable over Davis, and presented claims 7-10 dependent on the amended claim 1 should be also allowed.

AMENDMENT

10/807,111

- 5 -

Dkt. No.: OP-093000203

Accordingly, the application is deemed to be in condition for allowance and such a
Notice is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Yin Hung Chen
Yin-Hung Chen

AMENDMENT

- 8 -

10/807,111